



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,845	10/29/2003	Stephen P. Mangin	792-114	9143
23869	7590	07/13/2010	EXAMINER	
HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP 6900 JERICHO TURNPIKE SYOSSET, NY 11791			PRONE, CHRISTOPHER D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
3738				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/13/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/696,845	Applicant(s) MANGIN ET AL.
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER D. PRONE	Art Unit 3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2010.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11,14-17,23-25,27-32 and 34-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-7,15-17,24,25,28,29,31,32 and 34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4,8-11,14,23,27,30 and 35-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority Date

The priority date of this application is its filing date, 10/29/03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 8, 12-14, 23, 26, 27, 30, 33, 35, and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Strecker United States Patent 5,653,748 in view of Chevalier Jr. et al United States Patent 5,401,257.

Strecker discloses the invention substantially as claimed being a prosthetic delivery device (10) comprising a flexible elongated member (11) having proximal and distal ends, a means for releasably securing an expandable stent prosthesis (15) comprising a mesh. The mesh is formed from a crocheted material (14) including a thread having a plurality of loops and a trigger pull release (24). However Strecker fails to disclose a visual marker comprising a colored loop extending around the prosthesis that is a different color than the releasing means.

Chevalier discloses a stent and its delivery device comprising marker bands that have different colors when viewed under by direct vision because they are treated with a colorant in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of enhanced trackability.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the marker bands with colorant of Chevalier with the delivery device of Strecker in order to enhance the trackability of the implant.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Strecker as modified by Chevalier as applied to claims 1-4, 8, 12-14, 23, 26, 27, 30, 33, and 35 above, and further in view of Ravenscroft United States Patent 5,480,423.

Strecker as modified by Chevalier discloses the invention substantially as claimed being described supra. However, Strecker as modified by Chevalier does not disclose that his prosthesis expands to a larger radius and a shorter length upon implantation

Ravenscroft teaches the use of a prosthetic delivery device comprising a length shortening self-expanding stent in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of providing a concentrated expansion force within a body lumen, shown best in figures 2a – 2f.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the stent of Ravenscroft with the delivery device of Strecker as modified by Chevalier in order to provide a concentrated expansion force within a body lumen, which can be accurately tracked by the operator throughout the insertion process.

Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Strecker as modified by Chevalier as applied to claims 1-4, 8, 12-14, 23, 26, 27, 30, 33, and 35 above, and further in view of Fischell et al United States Patent 5,792,144

The combination of Strecker as modified by Chevalier discloses the invention substantially as claimed being described supra. However, the combination does not disclose that the radiopaque bands comprise silicone.

Fischell teaches the use of a stent delivery catheter comprising bands of a radiopaque metal coated in silicone in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of providing a durable visible marker for the operator.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the silicone coating with marker bands of Strecker as modified by Chevalier in order to provide a durable visible marker for the operator.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/26/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the rejection fails to disclose a mesh means or a colored band extending around the mesh. The rejection previously disclosed a means for securing the prosthesis to the elongated member in the form of a crocheted member. Because of the broad meaning of the word mesh the examiner is considering the crocheted material to read on the mesh requirement. Dictionary.com defines "mesh" as a knit, woven, or knotted material, which the crocheted material of Strecker qualifies as. In regards to the colored band, the combination relies on Chevalier to teach the use of

colorants in markers on stents. In view of this combination the art of the rejection comprises a loop with colorants that is at the end of and extends around the mesh.

In order to advance prosecution the applicant is advised to amend the claims to better define structural differences between the application and the art of record. The applicant's invention clearly comprises many more and longer windings than the art of record. The use of different colored markers, multiple markers in different locations, and different materials for markers is very old and well known within the art. Therefore the applicant is advised to amend the claims to better define the mesh and the release mechanism.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER D. PRONE whose telephone number is (571)272-6085. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fri 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher D Prone
Examiner
Art Unit 3738

/Christopher D Prone/

/Corrine M McDermott/

Application/Control Number: 10/696,845

Art Unit: 3738

Page 7

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3738